



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,436	01/14/2002	Darren Kenneth Rogers	1558(TOUCHSTONE)	5649

7590 03/27/2003
McGuire Woods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215

EXAMINER	
MEDLEY, MARGARET B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1714	

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/046,436

Applicant(s)

ROGERS, DARREN KENNETH

Examiner

Margaret B. Medley

Art Unit

1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-15 and 40-44 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-20 of co-pending Application No. 09/902,828. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-2, 4-5 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11-12 of co-pending Application No. 09/976,172. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the thermal conductivity of the instant claims would not be excluded from the claims of the co-pending application and surface area of the co-pending claims would not be excluded from the instant claims and therefore would not make a patent distinction.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1714

Claims 1-6 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of co-pending Application No. 09/941,342. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the free swell index of the instant claims would not be excluded from the co-pending claims and the coefficient of thermal expansion of the co-pending claims would not be excluded from the instant claims and therefore would not make a patentable distinction.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim 38 is objected to because of the following informalities: A space should be inserted to separate "said" and carbon in line 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 17 does not appear to further limit claim 1 and therefore is indefinite.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 16-27 and 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harnett 3,309,437 in view of Koppelman 4,127,391 combined with Madley et al (Madley) GB 1,489,690 and Kirk-Othmer.

Harnett teaches a porous based product having compressive strength typically in excess of 5,000 psi (note column 4, lines 1-9) when heated to 950⁰ C and an apparent density of 0.93 g/cc (note Table 1 for Example 4 and 5 and further graphitizing (note column 5, lines 20-44) which anticipates the instant claims 1-4 of Applicant. The apparent density of 0.93 g/cm³ of patentees renders obvious the apparent density of between about 0.1 and about 0.8 g/cm³ of applicants. It is the examiner's position that "about 0.8 g/cm" reads on 0.93 g/cc. Harnett is silent to the coal based product and having free index swell of between about 3.5 and about 5.0, and preferably between about 3.75 and about 4.5. Patentee also teaches that formed bodies are used for insulating blocks for furnaces and reactors, filters, etc note column 3, lines 12-22, and that the core products are formed inside containers made of graphite, stainless steel or cardboard, column 2, lines 4-11.

It would be obvious to the artisan in the art to use a coal based product as the starting material for the coke product in view of Koppelman and a coal with swelling index between 3 and 9 in view of Madley and Kirk-Othmer. Koppelman teaches coke produced from bituminous coal, column 1, line 17-68, Examples 1-2 and the Table at column 11. It is the examiner's position that since coke is produced from coal, it is a coal base product.

Patentees Madley teaches the artisan in the art that by varying the pretreatment conditions, e.g. temperature and reaction time, the swelling properties of a specific coal can be controlled to a substantial degree for the subsequent use of the coal in further process step, note page 1, lines 69-76. Madley further teaches a coal having a swell index of 3.5 which encompass the about 3.5 and about 5.0 range, and suggest the preferred range of about 3.75 and about 4.5 of the instant claims, note Madley for the example on page 2, lines 32 to page 3 line 10.

Art Unit: 1714

The Kirk-Othmer article teaches the artisan in the art that it is state of the art knowledge that the best cokes come from coals having swelling indexes between 4 and 9, the last paragraph one page 455 of Vol. 6. The article further discloses Application of Coal Petrology and Petrography, pages 429 to 434 of Vol. 6; particularly figure 3 at page 431 for swelling indexes of coal and Table 4 for the coal classification. It would be obvious to the artisan in the art to use the bituminous coal of Koppelman and particularly a coal having 3.5-9 swell index of the secondary references as the starting material coal of the primary reference having a swell index of between 4 and 9 to produce the best coke.

It is the examiner's position that the Gieseler initial softening temperature above @ 380⁰ C, a plastic range of at least about 50⁰ C and 75-to @ 100⁰ C, the fluidity of at least of several hundred ddpm, > 2000 ddpm and an expansion of at least 20% and at least 100% are properties that would be inherent when the select coal is as bituminous further rendering the instant claims obvious.

Claims 6-10, 28-39 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harnett 3,309,437 in view of Koppelman 4,127,391 combined with Madley et al (Madley) GB 1,489,690 and Kirk-Othmer as applied to claims 1-5, 16-27 and 40-43 above, and further in view of Harnett 3,309,437 in view of Koppelman 4,127,391 combined with Madley et al (Madley) GB 1,489,690 and Kirk-Othmer.

Harnett teaches a process for producing porous coal-based product produced from coal comprising the steps of heating coal particles in a mold carbonizing at a temperature over 600⁰ C at heat rate of 10⁰ C, cooling said carbonized body and further graphitizing said carbonized body,

Art Unit: 1714

note in the entirety, especially Examples 1-2 and 3-12 of table 1, column 1, line 51 to column 2, lines 1-35, column 3, lines 1-22 and 49 to column 4, lines 1-65 and column 6.

Applicants claimed process differs from that of the prior art in that the instant process comprises a soaking step and a controlled cooling step, and specific coal free index swell. It is the Examiner's position that the inclusion of a soaking step and controlled cooling step would be obvious in view of Koppelman. Koppelman teaches a soaking and a control cooling steps after a carbonizing step for treating coal, note the bridging paragraph of columns 6 and 7. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the soaking and control cooling steps of the secondary reference to the process of the primary reference as the cooling step because the use of two or more conventional steps to achieve the same cooling steps render the instant claims obvious.

Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harnett 3,309,437 in view of Koppelman 4,127,391 combined with Madley et al (Madley) GB 1,489,690 and Kirk-Othmer as applied to claims 1-5, 16-27 and 40-43 above, and further in view of Kuroda JP-0, 811,287,619A.

Harnett teaches a porous based product having comprehensive strength typically in excess of 5,000 psi (note page 4, line 1-9) when heated to 950°C and an apparent density of 0.93 g/cc (note Table 1 for examples 4 and 5) and further graphitizing (note columns 5, lines 20-44). Patentee's apparent density of between about 0.1 and about 0.8 g/cm³ reads on Applicants' apparent density of 0.93 g/cc. Patentee also teaches that formed bodies are used for insulating blocks for furnaces and reactors, filters, etc. (Note column 3, lines 12-22) and that the core

Art Unit: 1714

products are formed inside containers made of graphite, stainless steel or cardboard (note column 2, lines 4-11).

The instant claims of Applicants require the core to be laminated sheet product wherein Harnett with the secondary reference teachings is silent to the said laminated products being sheet products. It is the examiner's position that it would be obvious to the artisan in the art to use a core between laminate sheets in view of JP '876.

The JP '876 reference teach laminated sheets comprising a core of charcoal powder (graphitized coal product) and activated carbon powder (carbonized and coal product) note the English abstract and Figures 1-3. It would be obvious to the artisan in the art to use the laminated sheet with a core of the JP '876 patent as the laminated sheet with the core of Harnett with the combined teachings of the secondary references. The cores and sheets of JP '876 are of the same nature as the core and container of Harnett to be used for the same intended purposes as laminated products for walls, etc.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Margaret B. Medley whose telephone number is (703) 308-2518. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday--Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 10/046,436
Art Unit: 1714

Page 8

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

M.B. Medley/dh
March 25, 2003

Margaret B. Medley
MARGARET MEDLEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER